

**REMARKS**

Claims 37-42 and 48-52 are now pending. Applicant has amended claim 37, canceled claims 43-47, and added claims 48-52.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her consideration during the telephone interview of March 8, 2007, during that interview Applicant's representative explained that claim 37 was directed to the sending of a translation preference during an instant messaging session. Applicant has amended claim 37 to further clarify this aspect of the invention.

In the Advisory Action of January 18, 2007, the Examiner indicated that the amendments made to claim 37 in the Response to Final Office Action of December 22, 2006 raised new issues that require further consideration. Applicant would like to point out that the Stringham reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting claims 37-42 neither teaches nor suggests that an indication of a translation preference is sent from between a second device to a first device when an instant messaging session is established. For example, claim 37 now recites "establishing an instant messaging session between the first device and the second device." Claim 37 also recites "receiving by the first device from the second device during the established session an indication of the second translation preference." Claim 48 recites "a component that establishes an instant messaging session between the first device and the second device." Claim 48 also recites "a component that during the established instant messaging session . . . receives from the second device an indication of the second translation preference." Thus, each of the independent claims recite that a first device receives from the second device an indication of a second translation preference during an instant messaging session.

Claim 37 further recites "transmitting the translated message in the second translation preference to the second device as an instant message during the established session." Claim 48 recites "a component that transmits during the established instant

message session the translated message in the second translation message in the second translation preference to the second device." As such each of these claims additionally recites that the translated instant message is sent during that established instant messaging session. Stringham neither teaches nor suggests that a translated instant message is transmitted during a session in which a translation preference is received.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: 3-21-07

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio  
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000  
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant